

MONSTER CROWD HEARS COLONEL GARDNER'S OPENING SPEECH AT CHILlicothe

State and National Questions Masterfully Handled—Judge Lamm's Objections to the Land Bank Bill Shown to Be Purely "Political," Not Based on Reason.

A monster crowd greeted Col. Fred. D. Gardner, Democratic candidate for Governor, at the big tent meeting opening his campaign in the state. Almost every sentence was punctuated by applause. He fully measured up to public expectations. He said, in part:

Col. Gardner's Speech.

Fellow Citizens:

A few weeks ago we concluded one of the most spirited contests for the nomination for Governor in the history of the Democracy of Missouri. From the expressions received from the distinguished Democrats who contested the nomination with me and from those who supported them, I believe I am justified in saying that there isn't a Democrat in this great commonwealth today who does not consider that I am his candidate.

There shall be no Democratic factions. I expect and know that I will have all Democrats behind me and after I am elected all will be taken into the party's council. A divided party is powerless to fulfill its pledges to the public.

From one end of the state to the other Democracy is united, confident



FREDERICK D. GARDNER.
Democratic Candidate for Governor.

and militant. Victory for the whole ticket is certain. I want to express a deep sense of appreciation and obligation to the party for the honor conferred upon me, and I want you to know that I am not unmindful of the responsibility involved with the compliment extended. The Governor of Missouri should represent the state in a broad and patriotic way, with an eye seeing solely the welfare of the whole people. The present time presents an opportunity for great service and it is my ambition to fulfill the noble purposes for which the office was created and to measure up to its highest traditions. I believe that the destiny of this state can be best worked out through the principles of the Democratic party and if elected I will serve the people in a straightforward, common sense, businesslike way, without fear or favor.

The Mission of Democracy.

I am a Democrat because I believe that the ultimate ideals and best interests of the whole people in our state and national life can more completely be accomplished through the Democratic party than in any other way. It offers to the individual the largest measure of security, the greatest freedom of conscience, and the widest liberty of action consistent with the common good and the rights of others.

The fundamentals of Democracy are based upon equality of right and evenness of opportunity to all as opposed to special privilege to the few at the expense of the whole people. Democracy does not teach that one man, or class of men, should have advantage over the rest, but rather that "that law is a just law which makes for the interest of the greatest number." This is not a new doctrine—it is as old as the Declaration of Independence.

In my opinion these are the principles upon which we can safely stand and work out the new problems which confront us by reason of the new conditions which are constantly arising in the development and growth of this great commonwealth.

The Campaign for Governor of 1916.

So far as I am concerned the contest with my distinguished opponent in this race will not be conducted along personal lines. Judge Lamm is a distinguished lawyer, possessed of great learning, interspersed with a rare vein of wit and humor, and has closed an enviable career on the supreme bench of this state. I don't know that his professional career has furnished him any better training for the position of chief executive of Missouri than my business experience has furnished me.

Of the three departments of government the judicial is necessarily made up of lawyers; the legislative is largely composed of members of the legal fraternity, and for some time past the chief executive of Missouri has been selected from the bar; the Attorney General of Missouri is necessarily a lawyer, so that it does not seem to me that, facing as we are, rapidly changing conditions in our economic and industrial affairs, it requires a lawyer to manage the business affairs of the state, and that is after all the Governor's chief function. Therefore I do not think that under the circumstances the experience of a man who has devoted his

life to the problems of the law, qualify him any better for the office of Governor than the experience of a business man who has spent his whole life in working out problems of efficiency, economy and development in the every day affairs of a growing business beset with fierce competition and constantly changing business conditions. What we want to apply to present day questions in Missouri is not logic and theory, but rather reason and experience.

There is another difference between the Republican nominee for Governor and myself, and that is that he stands for the policy of Republicanism, and I stand for the doctrine of Democracy. He believes in the principles enunciated by Alexander Hamilton. I believe in the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson. He is committed to the fault finding, criticising campaign of Judge Hughes and I stand for the constructive, statesmanlike administration of Woodrow Wilson.

He stands for the stand pat, reactionary, special privilege, trust incubating Payne-Aldrich tariff—as the best method of raising revenues for the national government. I stand for the Underwood tariff, an income tax, an inheritance tax, and a tax on war supplies. The difference is that his method of raising taxes would place the burden on the consumer, ours on accumulated wealth, where it can be more easily borne.

He must stand sponsor for the Republican financial legislation which turned the nation's affairs over to a half dozen men in Wall street, enabling them to milk the nation at any time they chose through the so-called commercial panics. I stand for the federal service act which has forever done away with such an unbearable and unjust condition. Just imagine the opportunities the European war would have given Wall street to create financial panics had not the federal reserve act stared them in the face.

He must stand for the utter failure of his party to enact during their long tenure of office progressive laws to help and assist the farmer and the laboring man. I endorse each and every one of the splendid and numerous measures which have been recently enacted to promote and assist agriculture and to help and dignify labor.

His party proceeds upon the theory that federal courts are infallible and for years, while in power, refused to abolish government of employees by injunction, while my party, upon coming into power, abolished government by injunction and provided that all employees charged with being in contempt of a federal court in an equity proceeding involving labor disputes should be entitled to a trial by a jury of his peers. His party regarded human labor as a commodity, while my party has decreed that the labor of a human being is neither a commodity nor an article of commerce.

He must say why his party refused to give the people the parcel post system and always operated the post office department at a loss, whereas under our administration millions of dollars of surplus have been turned back into the treasury.

Judge Lamm seems to mistrust the people. Before and since the primary, in his speeches throughout the state, he has denounced the present state primary law, claiming that it breaks down the moral stamina of candidates by giving them enormous temptations to bid for votes by making all kinds of promises.

Judge Lamm ought to know, and probably does know, by this time, that if there had been no state primary law he could not have been nominated for Governor.

But when Judge Lamm submitted his cause to the voters of St. Louis he received 33,350 votes to 10,464 cast for his principal opponent. It was this vote that gave him the nomination; a vote that he never could have gotten in a convention.

As for me, I stand for the present state primary law. I have an abiding faith in the judgment of the people. They will not be misled by false promises. They are quick to detect the lack of stamina in any candidate. The people may occasionally make a mistake, but I hope the day may never come when the citizens composing the political parties in Missouri will be denied the right to name their own candidates. I favor any method for safeguarding the purity of the ballot, either at the primary or any other election.

The Republican state platform declares for the merit system in public office. Yet in their convention held the same day, the city press reports the fact that was able to control affairs used the promise of spoils to accomplish their ends. It is also notorious that the Republican organization of St. Louis is in open rebellion and defiance of the merit system of the new city charter. Governor Hadley's axe fell on the head of the most experienced and efficient public servants. And yet with their past and present record and future promise of spoils our Republican friends cry "Merit System."

Is my opponent willing to say to the people of Missouri that in the event of his election he will remove for cause only present public servants, and make new appointments only under the merit system, or examination plan, without regard to the politics of the applicant? This is what the merit system means—nothing short of that whatever.

Party Record.

In the state of Missouri the traditions and history of the past 50 years present practically an unbroken record of Democratic achievements accomplished, promises fulfilled, deeds done. Our great public school system, all our higher institutions of

learning, all our state institutions, our superb banking and insurance laws, our public service and corporation laws, and our numerous laws for the protection of working men, all owe their origin to the Democratic party and are monuments to the splendid patriotism, genius, courage and fidelity of those who have for generations carried the Democratic banner to victory in Missouri.

Taxation.

In 1873 when the Democratic party assumed control of the state's affairs, a bonded debt of \$40,000,000 was left as a heritage of Republican misgovernment. A tax rate of 50 cents was in effect. Wise and efficient Democratic rule has wiped out this debt and the state tax rate in Missouri is now 15 cents on the \$100, the lowest tax rate in the United States. Of this 15 cents, one-third or 5 cents, is returned for public schools, leaving only 10 cents to care for the entire remaining expense of the state. In other words—the citizen who owns property valued at \$5,000 assessed at 40 per cent or \$2,000, pays \$3 per year for the state support. In 96 out of 114 counties the total amount paid in by the counties is returned to them by the state. To be exact, these 96 counties in 1915 paid into the state treasury \$1,385,369.74, and received back \$2,144,043.82, or a net difference of \$758,674.15.

Now, can any Republican state show such a record?

Our Future Duty.

The Democratic party is alive to the new industrial, commercial and economic conditions and must shape its policies to meet them. We grasp their solution not with fear and trembling, but with confidence. It must never be the policy of our party to become saturated with conceit and complacency, we have perfect confidence that the legislation which we propose will result in even better financial conditions, and will also prepare the way for greater development of the industries of the state.

State Finances.

All well governed business institutions now have what is known as a budget—that is, a systematic, scientific method of estimating and apportioning their income and expenditure. This plan should also be a part of all modern systems of state and municipal government. It simply substitutes accuracy for haphazard guess work. Under our constitution the ideal budget system is impossible. The legislature appropriates any amount it pleases without regard to its receipts. But should the Governor I would approach a legal budget system just as nearly as possible by submitting to the appropriation committee an estimate of receipts prepared by the state officials, and indicating where the revenues should be expended. The committee could, of course, shift expenditures from one source to another, but I would tell them plainly that if the amount was over-appropriated I should veto all over appropriations. I shall see that the people secure the maximum amount of service for the minimum expenditure. I shall organize every department and institution of the state, over which the Governor has control, on strictly modern, business and efficiency lines.

Rural Credit System.

Agriculture is the base of the economic pyramid in the state of Missouri. This is primarily an agricultural state. As a result of our agricultural development we have built splendid towns and cities in Missouri where factories abound. I maintain that the success of the manufacturing industries of Missouri is largely dependent upon the success of the agricultural districts of Missouri. I would have a closer relation between the country and the city; between the farmer and merchant.

I notice my opponent, Judge Lamm, opposes a state rural credit system. He says that he does not think that the state of Missouri needs any such system in any form. In this Judge Lamm repudiates one of the planks of the platform adopted by the Republican party at its state convention held in Jefferson City in August, which declared in favor of a rural credit system.

The facts are, my fellow citizens, Judge Lamm is in perfect harmony with the other leaders of his party in opposing any remedial legislation in the interest of the farmers, and, just as the Republican leaders attempted to arouse the American people in opposition to the federal reserve banking act, so he is attempting to arouse the people of Missouri against a state rural credit system; indeed, the leaders of his party opposed the recently enacted federal farm loan act. It seems that Judge Lamm, by inference at least, approves the federal farm loan act, and maintains that this bill is adequate to render sufficient aid to the farmers. This is one of his specious reasons for opposing the Gardner Land Bank bill. In so far as he commends the federal farm loan act, which has placed the federal government behind a plan of rural credits to assist the 12,000,000 farmers in the United States, including 300,000 in Missouri, he pays tribute to the Democratic party which enacted it, and he is again at variance with his own party platform which denounces it.

When he states that the federal farm loan act will afford ample relief to Missouri farmers and should be exclusive in its operation, he shows that he is not informed as to the needs of the farmers of Missouri and of the purposes and intent of the farm loan act, or else he is indifferent to agricultural development in this state. The federal system was never intended to relieve the various states from their obligation to the farming class. The federal system was intended to point the way to correct principles and fundamental relief. It was also intended to standardize farm loans. It was expected that it would work hand in hand with a state system just as do our national banks and state banks—just as the Smith-Lever act is helping our states in better agriculture and as the recent federal good roads bill is helping all the states in road building.

This federal land credit system is founded upon the four cardinal principles that underlie my plan which was worked out and given to the public two years before the federal act was passed. "First—Rural credit system must be established by the state. Capital stock must be subscribed by the state, without dividends or interest (to accumulate surplus)."

"Second—Loans must be attainable for productive purposes only, and for a period of 25 years or less on a 50 per cent of appraised value."

"Third—Payments must be made on amortization or annual payments plan."

"Fourth—Debtors must be issued against the first deeds of trust, and in order to secure the farmer cheap money these bonds to be exempt from taxation."

The Democratic party is not working in the interest of any one class to the detriment or sacrifice of another. My friends, we must see to it that our farmers are not denied the opportunity and capital to cultivate and develop idle lands; to keep the boys on the farm; to enable the tenants to become land owners. The fields are being stripped. The cities are already crowded. When this government was started 90 per cent of the population was on the farm—50 years ago 66 per cent of our population was on the farm—today only about 30 per cent is on the farm. The census shows two-thirds of the largest agricultural counties in Missouri are losing in population, and that in a new state such as Kansas the agricultural communities are losing in population. In eight of the southern states the average earning capacity of a farmer is \$150 a year, or 75 cents a day. The census also shows that in the state of Iowa, taken as a whole, population is steadily losing. An investigation recently made of 674 farms in one county of New York 79 per cent of the young men have gone away. But we must protect and develop the agricultural interests of this country if we would produce the highest measure of happiness and prosperity.

Judge Lamm seems greatly perturbed about the state's ability to finance the bank at the beginning. If I am elected Governor, I shall pursue the course followed by business men under similar conditions, namely the accumulation of the capital by installments. For instance, I would ask for 25 per cent of the capital stock for the first year, and 25 per cent for each remaining year of my term.

Is it to be understood that if there is merit to the plan that a great state like Missouri, whose future hinges on the development of agriculture, can afford to hesitate? What is our history with reference to public enterprises? We appropriated a million dollars to the St. Louis World's Fair. We have appropriated over three million dollars for a new state house, and hundreds of thousands of dollars for other state institutions whenever the necessity required.

It must be borne in mind that the chief source of loaning capacity comes from the turn-over realized from bond sales with the best security on earth behind them—namely, Missouri farms. There is not a particle of hazard in such a transaction. It is so elemental that it is not even considered a financial risk at all.

My opponent says my plan is crude, yet practically every student, author and authority in American on land credits have held otherwise, including Prof. Fetter, Professor of Economics of Princeton, and ex-president of the American Economic Society—a man who has traveled all over the world studying this question.

I particularly call attention to the fact that a year ago while the federal bill was being discussed the great convention of the National Grange assembly in San Francisco, Cal., representing every congressional district in the United States, and after studying all foreign plans, and after proposed American plans, without a dissenting vote agreed that the Missouri idea was the model plan.

Judge Lamm states that the Gardner Land Bank Bill is in violation of section 26, article 12, of the Constitution of Missouri. I am persuaded that this is a political rather than a legal opinion. The section referred to reads as follows:

Section 26. Act Creating Banks to Be Submitted to the People—Exception. No act of the General Assembly authorizing or creating corporations or associations with banking powers (except banks of deposit or discount), nor amendments thereto, shall go into effect, or in any manner be enforced, unless the same shall be submitted to a vote of the qualified voters of the state, at the general election next succeeding the passage of the same, and be approved by a majority of the votes cast at such election.

Now the Forty-eighth General Assembly passed the act establishing the Missouri Land Bank and Rural Credits and in accordance with the express terms of the section cited, the bill is now being submitted to the people under the initiative clause of our constitution. The people know precisely what they are voting on. Not only that, but they are delegating to the legislature, as they have a perfect right to do, the power to "enact other special laws to amend and to improve the said act, or to supply omissions or correct defects therein." The proposed amendment changes the Constitution in three respects:

First—It authorizes the legislature to amend and improve, supply omissions and correct defects in the bill, thereby repealing that portion of the Constitution which provides that no such amendments shall be made until submitted to the people.

Second—It authorizes the General Assembly to appropriate one million dollars as a loan to the Land Bank.

Third—It authorizes the legislature to exempt the assets of the Land Bank and its bonds from taxation.

In regard to the legal aspect of the proposed amendment, when a majority of the people shall have voted in favor of this amendment, it becomes the expression of the sovereign will and as to all subjects covered these amendments are substituted for and suspend those provisions of the constitution now in force.

It is apparent, therefore, that this objection of Judge Lamm to this bill, as are all his other objections, is capricious. He searches for, takes notice and makes much of imagined faults and defects. No rural credit bill of Democratic origin would ever meet with Judge Lamm's approval while a candidate for Governor on the Republican ticket. He is not sitting as a judge, but is a candidate caviling at a constructive measure with which his opponent is identified.

In every move made by me in connection with the Land Bank Bill, I have followed the advice of able and disinterested lawyers. The bill was passed by the General Assembly composed largely of lawyers. It was passed hurriedly, but after due deliberation. It was not passed as a party measure. Forty-five of the 65 Republican members of the legislature voted for the bill, six being absent. In denouncing the bill Judge Lamm questions the intelligence of a majority of the Republican members of the last legislature. If you think the principles therein contained are sound, I beg of you not to be dissuaded from voting for the amendment because of the fault finding of Judge Lamm, the candidate.

Now, as to his statement relative to the "single tax," nothing could be more far-fetched nor a greater fallacy. Single tax means that all tax is to be levied against the land.

The farmer gets the loan from the institution at the exact rate at which the bonds are sold. Any tax imposed on these bonds would necessarily be added to the annual rate of interest, wherefore, in exempting the bonds from taxation, you are taking that much tax off the land.

The federal land bank system, which my opponent commands so highly, goes even farther in that respect than does our plan by reason of the fact that it not only exempts the bonds from state and county taxes, but exempts them from the income tax.

I also call attention to the fact that when my distinguished opponent was on the supreme bench he concurred in an opinion which exempted from taxation the stocks of all foreign corporations held in Missouri, of which it is estimated there are more than one billion dollars' worth. No one has ever suggested that this was single tax. No one has ever suggested that exemption from taxation of billions of dollars of United States bonds was single tax. But when it is proposed to cheapen money for the farmer by exempting the bonds on which his loans are secured from taxation the Republican party advances the backneyed argument that it is single tax. This is in keeping with all of Judge Lamm's criticism of the State Land Bank system. I do not believe the Missouri farmer will be misled by this sophistry.

My opponent's construction of the economic plan on which the rural credit system is founded is entirely faulty. For instance, he says that one-half of 1 per cent on the million dollars loaned would produce only 5,000 per year. He is in error here to the exact amount of 100 per cent. The bill plainly and specifically states that this sum is to be paid over the whole period of 25 years. He says further that no provision is made for accumulation of surplus. He entirely overlooks the fact that the capital stock furnished the institution of the state does not pay dividends. Hence the interest accruing from the use of this capital would produce a very large surplus.

Now the public is entitled to know just where my distinguished opponent and the Republican party of this state stand on rural credits. To sum up he says my plan is unnecessary from any viewpoint because of the federal system. His party's national platform in Chicago condemns the federal system. Mr. Hughes on the 21st at Milwaukee says the whole Democratic accomplishment must be wiped off the book, which would include the federal farm loan bill. Judge Lamm says in his Springfield speech, "We stand for rural credits by an efficient and just law." Now, I believe it is his duty to tell the people frankly why he commends a bill which his national party condemns, and which will be repealed if Judge Hughes is elected, and what sort of a law he would call equitable and just. And in the event of his election as Governor, what he would do to carry out the people's mandate to establish a State Land Bank. Judge Lamm's remarks with reference to state rural credits are hypocritical and clearly intended to confuse the people. He first says that he was opposed to any state rural credit system because unnecessary. He afterwards modifies this in his Springfield speech, but does not state how or when he would inaugurate a rural credit system in Missouri. The national platform disposes of the rural credit system with 29 words. The Missouri state Republican platform disposes of it with 28 words, and yet Judge Lamm has devoted practically all of his speeches to this subject.

Roads.

Our present Democratic administration in Missouri has aroused a keen interest in road development in this state. Not only men, horses and automobiles follow good roads, but civilization and religion as well. They are the servants of the farmer and the city man. This agitation has been going on in Missouri for a great many years. The time has come for earnest, active, united effort along this line.

Schools.

The public school system of America is the foundation of our democracy. It must ever be the apple of our eye. Perhaps I speak with particular fervor on this question, as my only education was received in a country public school, principally of the one-room type. My view of the school is that the time has arrived when our rural boy and girl must be given as good an education as any boy or girl in any public school in America. This must be our goal. We must prepare our country boys and girls to solve the problems at their own door. We have in the past attempted too much to prepare them to go to the cities, which are overcrowded. The "acid test" of good government is the true development of the man and woman. Now, how is this foundation to be laid other than by educating the boy and girl? The Democratic administration is gratified to tell the public that this year close to \$2,000,000 has been set aside for public schools, breaking all past records in the state's history.

Eleemosynary Institutions. It is claimed by our physicians that our eleemosynary institutions could be made more efficient and responsive to public demands if they were in charge of a central board and if removed from politics. As a layman I would favor such a law if it is shown to be practicable and one which would not saddle on the state additional expenses without compensating returns. I would oppose the creation of any additional boards or other bodies at this time unless conditions should arise showing imperative necessity for such a change.

Code Revision and New Constitution. We are told that our legal code is archaic and out of date. This is a matter in which the State Bar Association should assume the leadership. I should be governed by their guidance and that of the lawyer members of the legislature, and give my full support to any measure looking to a more speedy and adequate administration of justice. The Democratic platform provides that the people must decide by ballot as to whether a constitutional convention is to be called.

Appointive Offices.

I believe the time is now upon us when even our busiest citizens may no longer shirk their part of the responsibilities of government. Many of us have been loud in our criticisms of others, yet refusing to serve our fellow men when called upon. If I am elected Governor I shall appoint to office the highest type of men and shall insist that they serve even where it will be a personal sacrifice for them to do so. I shall see that our boards, other than professional, are made up of our people from all walks of life. Efficiency shall be my chief aim in selecting men for office.

Capital and Labor.

Missouri is fortunate in that as a rule employer and employee live in harmony and mutual esteem. Capital and labor are seeking a basis that is fair to both and co-operation seems to be the keynote that is guiding them in working out the difficult problems which have arisen. I believe the state should enact a modern workmen's compensation act that is just and satisfactory to all. The law should protect a man who is engaged in any hazardous work, against the day when by accident he may be thrown out of employment, helpless and penniless.

Peace.

The national campaign has opened, and the Republican candidate for President has now completed his swing around the circle. He has harangued the people about our foreign policy with all the adroitness of the trained jurist that he is, but he has failed to suggest a program, or to state what he would have done had he been President during the last four years. His campaign is purely destructive criticism. He has failed to offer a single constructive suggestion. He has derided our foreign policy, but has failed to show where the honor of the nation would have been better conserved by pursuing any other policy. His chief criticism of the Mexican policy is in the failure of President Wilson to recognize Huerta. To my mind the action of the President of the United States in this matter marked a new era in international relations. The nations of the world have been recognizing rulers regardless of the manner of method through which they have attained ascendancy, but when President Wilson realized that Huerta had gotten into control of the affairs of Mexico through the assassination of Madero he, in effect, announced to the world that the United States would not recognize the ruler of any nation on earth who attained his position by assassinating his predecessor.

Prosperity.

The Republican party has often proclaimed that the Democratic party is opposed to business. Present-day conditions so utterly contradict those charges that it will not require a long argument to meet them. Every mill in this land is now working night and day. Every dinner plate is full. Every man who seeks work is able to find it at higher wages than ever before. Bank clearings are the largest in the history of the country. Railroad earnings are three and one-half million dollars, exceeding by far any in history. Farm products are at top prices. Is there a man in any walk of life who will say that his vocation is less profitable than it was under Republican rule? And yet a great part of the commercial world is involved in war.

Education.

I believe that the American people want peace, prosperity and preparedness. I believe that the people of the state of Missouri will support the political party that has preserved peace and prosperity in these perilous times. We believe that the greatest happiness comes in contented homes—the family fireside where father, mother and children may gather at least once a day. The home promotes higher ideals than battlefields, where happiness is replaced by the heartaches of widows and the suffering of orphans. For my part, I am willing to go before the people of the country and offer peace as preferable to war; prosperity as preferable to paucity; universal business activity, where every man is afforded an opportunity, as preferable to a policy of protection to a few at the expense of the many.

Conclusion.

I believe present conditions can be better preserved under a Democratic than under a Republican administration. I believe the Democratic party can stand fearlessly before the people on the administration of Woodrow Wilson and the legislature which he has brought about. I believe that we can with absolute assurance ask your suffrage upon the policy which we propose to provide for the state of Missouri—a rural credit system, good roads and honest administration of eleemosynary institutions, adequate support to the educational institutions and a faithful, energetic and businesslike supervision of the general affairs of the government of the state.

without dividends or interest (to accumulate surplus). "Second—Loans must be attainable for productive purposes only, and for a period of 25 years or less on a 50 per cent of appraised value. "Third—Payments must be made on amortization or annual payments plan. "Fourth—Debtors must be issued against the first deeds of trust, and in order to secure the farmer cheap money these bonds to be exempt from taxation."

The Democratic party is not working in the interest of any one class to the detriment or sacrifice of another. My friends, we must see to it that our farmers are not denied the opportunity and capital to cultivate and develop idle lands; to keep the boys on the farm; to enable the tenants to become land owners. The fields are being stripped. The cities are already crowded. When this government was started 90 per cent of the population was on the farm—50 years ago 66 per cent of our population was on the farm—today only about 30 per cent is on the farm. The census shows two-thirds of the largest agricultural counties in Missouri are losing in population, and that in a new state such as Kansas the agricultural communities are losing in population. In eight of the southern states the average earning capacity of a farmer is \$150 a year, or 75 cents a day. The census also shows that in the state of Iowa, taken as a whole, population is steadily losing. An investigation recently made of 674 farms in one county of New York 79 per cent of the young men have gone away. But we must protect and develop the agricultural interests of this country if we would produce the highest measure of happiness and prosperity.

Judge Lamm seems greatly perturbed about the state's ability to finance the bank at the beginning. If I am elected Governor, I shall pursue the course followed by business men under similar conditions, namely the accumulation of the capital by installments. For instance, I would ask for 25 per cent of the capital stock for the first year, and 25 per cent for each remaining year of my term.

Is it to be understood that if there is merit to the plan that a great state like Missouri, whose future hinges on the development of agriculture, can afford to hesitate? What is our history with reference to public enterprises? We appropriated a million dollars to the St. Louis World's Fair. We have appropriated over three million dollars for a new state house, and hundreds of thousands of dollars for other state institutions whenever the necessity required.

It must be borne in mind that the chief source of loaning capacity comes from the turn-over realized from bond sales with the best security on earth behind them—namely, Missouri farms. There is not a particle of hazard in such a transaction. It is so elemental that it is not even considered a financial risk at all.

My opponent says my plan is crude, yet practically every student, author and authority in American on land credits have held otherwise, including Prof. Fetter, Professor of Economics of Princeton, and ex-president of the American Economic Society—a man who has traveled all over the world studying this question.

I particularly call attention to the fact that a year ago while the federal bill was being discussed the great convention of the National Grange assembly in San Francisco, Cal., representing every congressional district in the United States, and after studying all foreign plans, and after proposed American plans, without a dissenting vote agreed that the Missouri idea was the model plan.

Judge Lamm states that the Gardner Land Bank Bill is in violation of section 26, article 12, of the Constitution of Missouri. I am persuaded that this is a political rather than a legal opinion. The section referred to reads as follows:

Section 26. Act Creating Banks to Be Submitted to the People—Exception. No act of the General Assembly authorizing or creating corporations or associations with banking powers (except banks of deposit or discount), nor amendments thereto, shall go into effect, or in any manner be enforced, unless the same shall be submitted to a vote of the qualified voters of the state, at the general election next succeeding the passage of the same, and be approved by a majority of the votes cast at such election.

Now the Forty-eighth General Assembly passed the act establishing the Missouri Land Bank and Rural Credits and in accordance with the express terms of the section cited, the bill is now being submitted to the people under the initiative clause of our constitution. The people know precisely what they are voting on. Not only that, but they are delegating to the legislature, as they have a perfect right to do, the power to "enact other special laws to amend and to improve the said act, or to supply omissions or correct defects therein." The proposed amendment changes the Constitution in three respects:

First—It authorizes the legislature to amend and improve, supply omissions and correct defects in the bill, thereby repealing that portion of the Constitution which provides that no such amendments shall be made until submitted to the people.

Second—It authorizes the General Assembly to appropriate one million dollars as a loan to the Land Bank.

Third—It authorizes the legislature to exempt the assets of the Land Bank and its bonds from taxation.

In regard to the legal aspect of the proposed amendment, when a majority of the people shall have voted in favor of this amendment, it becomes the expression of the sovereign will and as to all subjects covered these amendments are substituted for and suspend those provisions of the constitution now in force.

It is apparent, therefore, that this objection of Judge Lamm to this bill, as are all his other objections, is capricious. He searches for, takes notice and makes much of imagined faults and defects. No rural credit bill of Democratic origin would ever meet with Judge Lamm's approval while a candidate for Governor on the Republican ticket. He is not sitting as a judge, but is a candidate caviling at a constructive measure with which his opponent is identified.

In every move made by me in connection with the Land Bank Bill, I have followed the advice of able and disinterested lawyers. The bill was passed by the General Assembly composed largely of lawyers. It was passed hurriedly, but after due deliberation. It was not passed as a party measure. Forty-five of the 65 Republican members of the legislature voted for the bill, six being absent. In denouncing the bill Judge Lamm questions the intelligence of a majority of the Republican members of the last legislature. If you think the principles therein contained are sound, I beg of you not to be dissuaded from voting for the amendment because of the fault finding of Judge Lamm, the candidate.

Now, as to his statement relative to the "single tax," nothing could be more far-fetched nor a greater fallacy. Single tax means that all tax is to be levied against the land.

The farmer gets the loan from the institution at the exact rate at which the bonds are sold. Any tax imposed on these bonds would necessarily be added to the annual rate of interest, wherefore, in exempting the bonds from taxation, you are taking that much tax off the land.

The federal land bank system, which my opponent commands so highly, goes even farther in that respect than does our plan by reason of the fact that it not only exempts the bonds from state and county taxes, but exempts them from the income tax.

I also call attention to the fact that when my distinguished opponent was on the supreme bench he concurred in an opinion which exempted from taxation the stocks of all foreign corporations held in Missouri, of which it is estimated there are more than one billion dollars' worth. No one has ever suggested that this was single tax. No one has ever suggested that exemption from taxation of billions of dollars of United States bonds was single tax. But when it is proposed to cheapen money for the farmer by exempting the bonds on which his loans are secured from taxation the Republican party advances the backneyed argument that it is single tax. This is in keeping with all of Judge Lamm's criticism of the State Land Bank system. I do not believe the